arXiv:1605.00119v1 [cs.DS] 30 Apr 2016

Automatic Parameter Derivations in k2U Framework

Jian-Jia Chen and Wen-Hung Huang
Department of Informatics
TU Dortmund University, Germany

Cong Liu
Department of Computer Science
The University of Texas at Dallas

Abstract

We have recently developed a general schedulability test framework, called $\mathbf{k^2U}$*, which can be applied to deal with a large variety of task models that have been widely studied in real-time embedded systems. The* $\mathbf{k^2U}$ *framework provides several means for the users to convert arbitrary schedulability tests (regardless of platforms and task models) into polynomial-time tests with closed mathematical expressions. However, the applicability (as well as the performance) of the* $\mathbf{k^2U}$ *framework relies on the users to index the tasks properly and define certain constant parameters.*

This report describes how to automatically index the tasks properly and derive those parameters. We will cover several typical schedulability tests in real-time systems to explain how to systematically and automatically derive those parameters required by the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ *framework. This automation significantly empowers the* $\mathbf{k^2U}$ *framework to handle a wide range of classes of real-time execution platforms and task models, including uniprocessor scheduling, multiprocessor scheduling, self-suspending task systems, real-time tasks with arrival jitter, services and virtualizations with bounded delays, etc.*

1 Introduction

To analyze the worst-case response time or to ensure the timeliness of the system, for each of individual task and platform models, researchers tend to develop dedicated techniques that result in schedulability tests with different time/space complexity and accuracy of the analysis. A very widely adopted case is the schedulability test of a (constrained-deadline) sporadic real-time task τ_k under fixed-priority scheduling in uniprocessor systems, in which the time-demand analysis (TDA) developed in [5] can be adopted. That is, if

$$\exists t \text{ with } 0 < t \leq D_k \;\; and \;\; C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t, \tag{1}$$

then task τ_k is schedulable under the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm, where $hp(\tau_k)$ is the set of tasks with higher priority than τ_k, D_i, C_i, and T_i represent τ_i's relative deadline, worst-case execution time, and period, respectively. TDA requires pseudo-polynomial-time complexity to check the time points that lie in $(0, D_k]$ for Eq. (1). The utilization U_i of a sporadic task τ_i is defined as C_i/T_i.

However, it is not always necessary to test all possible time points to derive a safe worst-case response time or to provide sufficient schedulability tests. The general and key concept to obtain sufficient schedulability tests in $\mathbf{k^2U}$ in [3] and $\mathbf{k^2Q}$ in [2] is to test only a subset of such points for verifying the schedulability. Traditional fixed-priority schedulability tests often have pseudo-polynomial-time (or even higher) complexity. The idea implemented in the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ and $\mathbf{k^2Q}$ frameworks is to provide a general k-point schedulability test, which only needs to test k points under *any* fixed-priority scheduling when checking schedulability of the task with the k^{th} highest priority in the system. Suppose that there are $k-1$ higher priority tasks, indexed as $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{k-1}$, than task τ_k. The success of the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework is based on a k-point effective schedulability test, defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Chen et al. [3])**.** *A k-point effective schedulability test is a sufficient schedulability test of a fixed-priority scheduling policy, that verifies the existence of $t_j \in \{t_1, t_2, \ldots t_k\}$ with $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \cdots \leq t_k$ such that*

$$C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i t_i U_i \leq t_j, \tag{2}$$

where $C_k > 0$, $\alpha_i > 0$, $U_i > 0$, and $\beta_i > 0$ are dependent upon the setting of the task models and task τ_i. □

The $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework [3] assumes that the corresponding coefficients α_i and β_i in Definition 1 are given. How to derive them depends on the task models, the platform models, and the scheduling policies. Provided that these coefficients α_i, β_i, C_i, U_i for every higher priority task τ_i are given, the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework can find the worst-case assignments of the values t_i for the higher-priority tasks τ_i.

Although several applications were adopted to demonstrate the power and the coverage of the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework, we were not able to provide an automatic procedure to construct the required coefficients α_i and β_i in Definition 1 in [3]. Instead, we stated in [3] as follows:

> *The choice of good parameters α_i and β_i affects the quality of the resulting schedulability bounds. ..... However, deriving the* good *settings of α_i and β_i is actually not the focus of this paper. The framework does not care how the parameters α_i and β_i are obtained. The framework simply derives the bounds according to the given parameters α_i and β_i, regardless of the settings of α_i and β_i. The correctness of the settings of α_i and β_i is not verified by the framework.*

Contributions: This report explains how to automatically derive those parameters needed in the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework. We will cover several typical schedulability tests in real-time systems to explain how to systematically and automatically derive those parameters required by the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework. This automation significantly empowers the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework to handle a wide range of classes of real-time execution platforms and task models, including uniprocessor scheduling, multiprocessor scheduling, self-suspending task systems, real-time tasks with arrival jitter, services and virtualizations with bounded delays, etc. More precisely, if the corresponding (exponential time or pseudo-polynomial-time) schedulability test is in one of the classes provided in this report, the derivations of the hyperbolic-form schedulability tests, utilization-based analysis, etc. can be automatically constructed.

Given an arbitrary schedulability test, there are many ways to define a corresponding k-point effective schedulability test. The constructions of the coefficients in this report may not be the best choices. All the constructions in this report follow the same design philosophy: *We first identify the tasks that can release at least one more job at time $0 < t < D_k$ in the schedulability test and define the effective test point of such a task at its last release before D_k.* There may be other more effective constructions for different schedulability tests. These opportunities are not explored in this report.

Organizations. The rest of this report is organized as follows:

- The basic terminologies and models are presented in Section 2.
- We will present three classes of applicable schedulability tests, which can allow automatic parameter derivations:
  - **Constant inflation** in Section 3.1: This class covers a wide range of applications in which the workload of a higher-priority task may have a constant inflation to quantify the additional workload in the analysis window.
  - **Bounded-delayed service** in Section 3.2: This class covers a wide range of applications in which the computation service provided to the task system can be lower bounded by a constant slope with a constant offset.
  - **Arrival jitter** in Section 3.3: This class covers a wide range of applications in which a higher-priority task may have arrival jitter in the analysis window.

Please note that we will not specifically explain how to use the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework in this report. Please refer to [3] for details. However, for completeness the key lemmas in [3] will be summarized in Section 2.

2 Models and Terminologies

2.1 Basic Task and Scheduling Models

This report will introduce the simplest settings by using the ordinary sporadic real-time task model, even though the frameworks target at more general task models. We define the terminologies here for completeness. A sporadic task τ_i is released repeatedly, with each such invocation called a job. The j^{th} job of τ_i, denoted $\tau_{i,j}$, is released at time $r_{i,j}$ and has an absolute deadline at time $d_{i,j}$. Each job of any task τ_i is assumed to have C_i as its worst-case execution time. The response time of a job is defined as its finishing time minus its release time. Associated with each task τ_i are a period T_i, which specifies the minimum time between two consecutive job releases of τ_i, and a deadline D_i, which specifies the relative deadline of each such job, i.e., $d_{i,j} = r_{i,j} + D_i$. The worst-case response time of a task τ_i is the maximum response time among all its jobs. The utilization of a task τ_i is defined as $U_i = C_i/T_i$.

A sporadic task system τ is said to be an implicit-deadline task system if $D_i = T_i$ holds for each τ_i. A sporadic task system τ is said to be a constrained-deadline task system if $D_i \leq T_i$ holds for each τ_i. Otherwise, such a sporadic task system τ is an arbitrary-deadline task system.

A task is said *schedulable* by a scheduling policy if all of its jobs can finish before their absolute deadlines, i.e., the worst-case response time of the task is no more than its relative deadline. A task system is said *schedulable* by a scheduling policy if all the tasks in the task system are schedulable. A *schedulability test* is to provide sufficient conditions to ensure the feasibility of the resulting schedule by a scheduling policy.

Throughout the report, we will focus on fixed-priority scheduling. That is, each task is associated with a priority level. We will only present the schedulability test of a certain task τ_k, that is under analysis. For notational brevity,

in the framework presentation, we will implicitly assume that there are $k-1$ tasks, says $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{k-1}$ with higher-priority than task τ_k. *These $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are assumed to be schedulable before we test task τ_k.* We will use $hp(\tau_k)$ to denote the set of these $k-1$ higher priority tasks, when their orderings do not matter. Moreover, we only consider the cases when $k \geq 2$, since $k = 1$ is usually trivial.

Note that different task models may have different terminologies regarding to C_i and U_i. Here, we implicitly assume that U_i is always C_i/T_i. The definition of C_i can be very dependent upon the task systems.

2.2 Properties of $\mathbf{k^2U}$

By using the property defined in Definition 1, we can have the following lemmas in the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework [3]. All the proofs of the following lemmas are in [3].

Lemma 1 (Chen et al. [3])**.** *For a given k-point effective schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, defined in Definition 1, in which $0 < t_k$ and $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$, and $0 < \beta_i \leq \beta$ for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if the following condition holds*

$$\frac{C_k}{t_k} \leq \frac{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + 1}{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}(\beta U_j + 1)} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 2 (Chen et al. [3])**.** *For a given k-point effective schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, defined in Definition 1, in which $0 < t_k$ and $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$ and $0 < \beta_i \leq \beta$ for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if*

$$\frac{C_k}{t_k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \frac{(k-1)((\alpha+\beta)^{\frac{1}{k}} - 1) + ((\alpha+\beta)^{\frac{1}{k}} - \alpha)}{\beta}. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 3 (Chen et al. [3])**.** *For a given k-point effective schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, defined in Definition 1, in which $0 < t_k$ and $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$ and $0 < \beta_i \leq \beta$ for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if*

$$\beta \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + 1}{\frac{C_k}{t_k} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\right). \tag{5}$$

Lemma 4 (Chen et al. [3])**.** *For a given k-point effective schedulability test of a fixed-priority scheduling algorithm, defined in Definition 1, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm, in which $0 < t_k$ and $0 < \alpha_i$ and $0 < \beta_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, if the following condition holds*

$$0 < \frac{C_k}{t_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{U_i(\alpha_i + \beta_i)}{\prod_{j=i}^{k-1}(\beta_j U_j + 1)}. \tag{6}$$

3 Classes of Applicable Schedulability Tests

We will present three classes of applicable schedulability tests, which can allow automatic parameter derivations:

- **Constant inflation**: This class covers a wide range of applications in which the workload of a higher-priority task may have a constant inflation to quantify the additional workload in the analysis window.
- **Bounded delayed service**: This class covers a wide range of applications in which the computation service provided to the task system can be lower bounded by a constant slope with a constant offset.
- **Arrival jitter**: This class covers a wide range of applications in which a higher-priority task may have arrival jitter in the analysis window.

3.1 Constant Inflation

Suppose that the schedulability test is as follows:

$$\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t. } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq t, \tag{7}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $b \geq 0$. We now classify the task set $hp(\tau_k)$ into two subsets:

- $hp_1(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks with periods smaller than D_k.
- $hp_2(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks with periods greater than or equal to D_k.

Therefore, we can rewrite Eq. (7) to

$$\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t. } C'_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq t, \tag{8}$$

where C'_k is defined as $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} \sigma(1+b)C_i$.

Theorem 1. *For Eq.* (8)*, the k-point effective schedulability test in Definition 1 is with the following settings:*

- $t_k = D_k$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$, $t_i = \left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_i = g_i T_i$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* α_i *is* $\frac{\sigma(g_i+b)}{g_i}$ *with* $0 < \alpha_i \leq \sigma(1+b)$*, and*
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* β_i *is* $\frac{\sigma}{g_i}$ *with* $0 < \beta_i \leq \sigma$.

The tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ are indexed according to non-decreasing t_i defined above to satisfy Definition 1.

Proof. Let t_i be $\left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right) T_i = g_i T_i$, where g_i is an integer. By the definition of $hp_1(\tau_k)$, we know that $g_i \geq 1$. We index the tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ according to non-decreasing t_i. We assume that there are $k-1$ tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ for notational brevity.

Therefore, the left-hand side of Eq. (8) at time $t = t_j$ upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_j}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \\
\leq\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \\
=\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma \left((g_i+1)C_i + bC_i \right) + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma \left(g_i C_i + bC_i \right) \\
=\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sigma \left(g_i C_i + bC_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma \cdot C_i \\
=_1\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\sigma(g_i+b)}{g_i} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{\sigma}{g_i} t_i U_i, \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \cdots \leq t_k = D_k$ in our index rule, and $=_1$ comes from the setting that $C_i = U_i T_i = \frac{1}{g_i} t_i U_i$. That is, the test in Eq. (8) can be safely rewritten as

$$(\exists t_j | j = 1, 2, \ldots, k), \qquad C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i t_i U_i \leq t.$$

Therefore, we can conclude the compatibility of the test with the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework by setting $\alpha_i = \frac{\sigma(g_i+b)}{g_i}$ and $\beta_i = \frac{\sigma}{g_i}$. Due to the fact that $g_i \geq 1$, we also know that $0 < \alpha_i = \sigma(1 + \frac{b}{g_i}) \leq \sigma(1+b)$ and $0 < \beta_i \leq \sigma$. This concludes the proof. □

We can now directly apply Lemmas 1, 2, and 3 for the test in Eq. (8).

Corollary 1. *For a schedulability test in Eq.* (8)*, task τ_k is schedulable if*

$$\left(\frac{C'_k}{D_k} + (1+b) \right) \prod_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} (\sigma U_i + 1) \leq 2 + b, \qquad (10)$$

or if

$$\sigma \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} U_i \leq \ln \left(\frac{2+b}{\frac{C'_k}{D_k} + 1 + b} \right) \qquad (11)$$

Proof. This comes directly from Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 and Lemma 3. □

3.1.1 Applications

This class of schedulability tests in Eq. (7) covers quite a lot of cases in both uniprocessor and multiprocessor systems.

In uniprocessor systems:

- Constrained-deadline and implicit-deadline uniprocessor task scheduling [6, 8]: A simple schedulability test for this case is to set $\sigma = 1$ and $b = 0$ in Eq. (7). This is used to demonstrate the usefulness of the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework in [3].

- Uniprocessor non-preemptive scheduling [10]: This is a known case in which C_k should be set to $C_k + \max_{\tau_i \in lp(\tau_k)} C_i$, $\sigma = 1$ and $b = 0$ in Eq. (7), where $lp(\tau_k)$ is the set of the lower-priority tasks than task τ_k. This is implicitly used in [10].

- Bursty-interference [7]: This is a known case in which $\sigma = 1$ and b is set to a constant to reflect the bursty interference for the first job in the analysis window in Eq. (7). It is shown in [7] that this can be used to model the schedulability analysis of deferrable servers and self-suspending task systems (by setting C_k to $C_k + S_k$, where S_k is the maximum self-suspending time of task τ_k).

In multiprocessor systems with M processors and constrained deadline task sets:

- Multiprocessor global DM/RM scheduling for sporadic task systems: A simple schedulability test in this case is to set $\sigma = \frac{1}{M}$ and $b = 1$ in Eq. (7). This is used to demonstrate the usefulness of the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework in [3].

- Multiprocessor global DM/RM scheduling for self-suspending task systems and directed-acyclic-graph (DAG) task structures: This is similar to the above case for sporadic task systems in which $\sigma = \frac{1}{M}$ and $b = 1$ by setting different equivalent values of C_k in Eq. (7). For details, please refer to [3].

- Multiprocessor partitioned RM/DM scheduling for sporadic task systems: Testing whether a task τ_k can be feasibly assigned *statically* on a processor can be done by setting $\sigma = \frac{1}{M}$ and $b = 0$ in Eq. (7). This is used in [1] for improving the speedup factors and utilization-based schedulability tests.

3.2 Bounded Delay Services

We now discuss another class of schedulability tests by considering *bounded services*. In the class of the schedulability tests in Eq. (7), the right-hand side of the inequality is always t. Here, in this subsection, we will change the right-hand side of Eq. (7) to $A(t)$, where $A(t)$ is defined to quantify the minimum service provided by the system in any interval length $t > 0$ (after the normalization for the schedulability test of task τ_k). We will consider the following schedulability test for verifying the schedulability

of task τ_k:

$$\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t. } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq A(t), \tag{12}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $b \geq 0$ are constants. We will specifically consider two types of $A(t)$:

- *Segmented service curves*: An example of such a case is the time division multiple access (TDMA) arbitrary policy [9, 12] to provide fixed time slots with σC_{slot} total amount of service in every TDMA cycle length T_{cycle}. In this case, we consider that

$$A(t) = t - \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil \cdot (T_{cycle} - \sigma C_{slot}). \tag{13}$$

  where T_{cycle} and C_{slot} are specified as constants. Note that the setting of $A(t)$ in Eq. (13) is an approximation of the original TDMA service curve, to be discussed later.

- *Bounded delay service curves*: The service provided by the system is lower bounded by a constant slope γ when $t \geq t_{delay}$, where γ and t_{delay} are specified as constants. Specifically, in this case,

$$A(t) = \max\{0, \gamma(t - t_{delay})\}. \tag{14}$$

Figure 1 provides an example for the above two cases. We will discuss how these two bounds in Eq. (13) and Eq. (14) are related to TMDA and other hierarchical scheduling policies.

3.2.1 Segmented service curve: $A(t)$ in Eq. (13)

For Eq. (12), in which $A(t)$ is defined in Eq. (13), the schedulability test of task τ_k is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \\ &\leq\ t - \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil \cdot (T_{cycle} - \sigma C_{slot}) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\sigma > 0$, $b \geq 0$, C_{slot}, and T_{slot} are constants with $T_{cycle} - \sigma C_{slot} \geq 0$. The above test can be reorganized as

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &C_k + \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil (\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot}) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \quad \leq t. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The above test can be imagined as if there is a virtual higher-priority task $\tau_{virtual}$ with period T_{cycle} and execution time $\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot}$. In this formulation, the virtual task $\tau_{virtual}$ does not have any inflation. If $C_k - \sigma \cdot b \cdot (\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot}) > 0$, we can further set C'_k as $C_k - \sigma \cdot b \cdot (\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot})$, and the schedulability test of task τ_k becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &C'_k + \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil \cdot (\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot}) + b(\frac{T_{cycle}}{\sigma} - C_{slot}) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq t. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Therefore, we have reformulated the test to the same case in Eq. (7) by adding a virtual higher-priority task $\tau_{virtual}$. We can directly use Theorem 1 for this class of schedulability tests.

3.2.2 Bounded delay service curve: $A(t)$ in Eq. (14)

For Eq. (12), in which $A(t)$ is defined in Eq. (14), the schedulability test of task τ_k is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists t_{delay} < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq \gamma(t - t_{delay}), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $\sigma > 0$, $b \geq 0$, $\gamma > 0$, and $0 < t_{delay} < D_k$ are constants. This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists t_{delay} < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &\frac{C_k + \gamma t_{delay}}{\gamma} + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq t. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

It is also clear that for any $0 < t \leq t_{delay}$, the above inequality never holds when $C_k > 0$. Therefore, we can change the boundary condition from $t_{delay} < t$ to $0 < t$ safely. That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ s.t.} \\ &\frac{C_k + \gamma t_{delay}}{\gamma} + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + bC_i \right) \leq t. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

With the above reformulation, the test is similar to that in Eq. (7), where σ in Eq. (7) is defined as $\frac{\sigma}{\gamma}$, and C_k in Eq. (7) is defined as $\frac{C_k + \gamma t_{delay}}{\gamma}$. Therefore, this case is now reduced to the same case in Eq. (7). We can directly use Theorem 1 for this class of schedulability tests.



Figure 1: An example of delayed service curve: $\sigma = 1$, $C_{slot} = 2$, and $T_{cycle} = 5$, where $\gamma = \frac{\sigma C_{slot}}{T_{cycle}} \leq 1$ and $t_{delay} = T_{cycle} - \sigma C_{slot}$ in Eq. (14).

3.2.3 Applications for TDMA

Suppose that the system provides a time division multiple access (TDMA) policy to serve an implicit-deadline sporadic task system with a TDMA cycle T_{cycle} and a slot length C_{slot}. The bandwidth of the TDMA is $\gamma = \frac{C_{slot}}{T_{cycle}}$. As shown in [11], the service provided by the TDMA policy in an interval length t is at least $\max\{\left\lfloor \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rfloor C_{slot}, t - \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil \cdot (T_{cycle} - C_{slot})\}$. The service curve can still be lower-bounded by ignoring the term $\left\lfloor \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rfloor C_{slot}$, which leads to $t - \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_{cycle}} \right\rceil \cdot (T_{cycle} - C_{slot})$, as a segmented service curve described in Eq. (13). Another way is to use a linear approximation [12], as a bounded delay service curve in Eq. (14), to quantify the lower bound on the service provided by the TDMA. It can be imagined that the service starts when $t_{delay} = T_{cycle} - C_{slot}$ with utilization $\gamma = T_{cycle}/C_{slot}$. Therefore, the service provided by the TDMA in an interval length t is lower bounded by $\max\{0, t - t_{delay} + \gamma \cdot (t - t_{delay}\}$.

These two different approximations and the original TDMA service curve are all presented in Figure 1. By adopting the segmented service curve, the schedulability test for task τ_k can be described by Eq. (15) with $\sigma = 1$ and $b = 0$. By the result in Sec. 3.2.1, we can directly conclude that $0 < \alpha_i \leq 1$ and $0 < \beta_i \leq 1$ for $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ under RM scheduling, and, hence, the schedulability test of task τ_k if $T_{cycle} < T_k$ is

$$\left(\frac{T_{cycle} - C_{slot}}{T_{cycle}} + 1\right)(U_k + 1) \prod_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} (U_i + 1) \leq 2$$

$$\Rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{k} (U_i + 1) \leq \frac{2}{2 - \gamma}. \tag{21}$$

Therefore, if $T_{cycle} < T_k$, we can conclude that the utilization bound is $\sum_{i=1}^{k} U_i \leq k((\frac{2}{2-\gamma})^{\frac{1}{k}} - 1)$. This bound is identical to the result $\ln(\frac{2}{2-\gamma})$ presented by Sha [9] when $k \to \infty$.

If $T_{cycle} \geq T_k$, the virtual task $\tau_{virtual}$ created in Sec. 3.2.1 should be part of $hp_2(\tau_k)$ defined in Sec. 3.1. Therefore, the schedulability test of task τ_k if $T_{cycle} \geq T_k$ is

$$(U_k + \frac{T_{cycle} - C_{slot}}{T_k} + 1) \prod_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} (U_i + 1) \leq 2$$

$$\Rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (U_i + 1) \leq \frac{2}{1 + U_k + \frac{T_{cycle}}{T_k}(1 - \gamma)}. \tag{22}$$

If $T_{cycle} \geq T_k$ when k, we can conclude that task τ_k is schedulable under RM scheduling if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \ln(2) - \ln(1 + U_k + \frac{T_{cycle}}{T_k}(1 - \gamma))$.

For the case with the bounded delay service curve, we can use Eq. (18) with $t_{delay} = T_{cycle} - C_{slot}$, $\sigma^* = 1$, $b = 0$, and $\gamma = T_{cycle}/C_{slot}$. This results in the following schedulability test by using Corollary 1 for RM scheduling

$$\left(\frac{C_k + \gamma t_{delay}}{\gamma T_k} + 1\right) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(\frac{U_i}{\gamma} + 1\right) \leq 2. \tag{23}$$

Therefore, if $\frac{t_{delay}}{T_k}$ is negligible, i.e., the TDMA cycle is extremely shorter than T_k, then, we can conclude a utilization bound of $\gamma \ln 2$, which dominates $\ln(\frac{2}{2-\gamma})$. However, if t_{delay} is very close to T_k, then the test in Eq. (21) is better.

Note that the above treatment can be easily extended to handle deferrable servers, sporadic servers, polling servers, and constrained-deadline task systems. Extending the analysis to multiprocessor systems is also possible if the schedulability test can be written as Eq. (18).

3.3 Arrival Jitter

Suppose that the schedulability test is as follows:

$$\exists 0 < t \le D_k \text{ s.t. } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \le t, \tag{24}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $\delta \ge 0$. Note that if δ is an integer, then this is a special case of Eq. (7). We will first focus on the cases when δ is not an integer. We again classify the task set $hp(\tau_k)$ into two subsets:

- $hp_2(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks τ_i with $\left\lceil \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil$ equal to $\lceil \delta \rceil$.
- $hp_1(\tau_k)$ is $hp(\tau_k) \setminus hp_2(\tau_k)$.

Therefore, we can rewrite Eq. (24) to

$$\exists 0 < t \le D_k \text{ s.t. } C'_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \le t, \tag{25}$$

where C'_k is defined as $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} \sigma \lceil \delta \rceil C_i$.

Theorem 2. *For Eq.* (25)*, the k-point effective schedulability test in Definition 1 is with the following settings:*

- $t_k = D_k$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, set* $g_i = \left\lfloor \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rfloor$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, set* $t_i = \left(\left\lfloor \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rfloor - \delta \right) T_i = (g_i - \delta) T_i$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* α_i *is* $\frac{\sigma g_i}{g_i - \delta}$ *with* $0 < \alpha_i \le \frac{\sigma \lceil \delta \rceil}{\lceil \delta \rceil - \delta}$*, and*
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* β_i *is* $\frac{\sigma}{g_i - \delta}$ *with* $0 < \beta_i \le \frac{\sigma}{\lceil \delta \rceil - \delta}$.

The tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ are indexed according to non-decreasing t_i defined above to satisfy Definition 1.

Proof. By the definition of t_i and $hp_1(\tau_k)$, we know that g_i is an integer with $g_i > \delta$. By following the same procedure in the proof of Theorem 1, the left-hand side in Eq. (25) at time $t = t_j$ is upper bounded by whether

$$\begin{aligned}
& C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_j + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \\
\le\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_i + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \\
\le\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma (g_i + 1) C_i + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma g_i C_i \\
=\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sigma g_i C_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sigma C_i \\
=_1\ & C'_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\sigma g_i}{g_i - \delta} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{\sigma}{g_i - \delta} t_i U_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the last equality comes from the setting that $C_i = T_i U_i = \frac{1}{g_i - \delta} t_i U_i$.

It is not difficult to see that $\frac{1}{g_i - \delta}$ and $\frac{g_i}{g_i - \delta}$ are both decreasing functions with respect to g_i if $g_i > \delta$. Therefore, we know that $0 < \alpha_i \le \frac{\sigma \lceil \delta \rceil}{\lceil \delta \rceil - \delta}$ and $0 < \beta_i \le \frac{\sigma}{\lceil \delta \rceil - \delta}$ since g_i is an integer. We therefore conclude the proof. □

The above analysis may be improved by further annotating $hp_1(\tau_k)$ to enforce $g_i > \delta + 1$ if $\lceil \delta \rceil$ is very close to δ.

Corollary 2. *Suppose that we classify the task set $hp(\tau_k)$ into two subsets:*

- *$hp_2(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks τ_i with $\left\lceil \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil$ less than or equal to $\lceil \delta \rceil + 1$.*
- *$hp_1(\tau_k)$ is $hp(\tau_k) \setminus hp_2(\tau_k)$.*

Then, for each task $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$, we have $0 < \alpha_i \le \frac{\sigma(\lceil \delta \rceil + 1)}{\lceil \delta \rceil + 1 - \delta}$ and $0 < \beta_i \le \frac{\sigma}{\lceil \delta \rceil + 1 - \delta}$ for the schedulability test in Eq. (25)*, where C'_k is defined as $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} \sigma \left\lceil \frac{D_k + \delta T_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i$.*

Proof. This is identical to the proof of Theorem 2 by using the fact $g_i > \delta + 1$ for a task τ_i in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ defined in this corollary. □

The quantification of the arrival jitter in Eq. (24) assumes an upper bounded jitter δT_i for each task $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$. In many cases, the higher-priority tasks have independent jitter terms. Putting the arrival jitter of task τ_i to δT_i is sometimes over pessimistic. For the rest of this section, suppose that the schedulability test is as follows:

$$\exists 0 < t \le D_k \text{ s.t. } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t + J_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \le t, \tag{27}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $J_i \ge 0$ for every $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$. We again classify the task set $hp(\tau_k)$ into two subsets:

- $hp_2(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks τ_i with $\left\lceil \frac{D_k + J_i}{T_i} \right\rceil$ equal to $\lceil J_i / T_i \rceil$.
- $hp_1(\tau_k)$ is $hp(\tau_k) \setminus hp_2(\tau_k)$.

Therefore, we can rewrite Eq. (27) to

$$\exists 0 < t \le D_k \text{ s.t. } C'_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} \sigma \left(\left\lceil \frac{t + J_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \le t, \tag{28}$$

where C'_k is defined as $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} \sigma \lceil J_i / T_i \rceil C_i$

Theorem 3. *For each task τ_i in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ in Eq.* (28)*, the k-point effective schedulability test in Definition 1 is with the following settings:*

- $t_k = D_k$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, set* $g_i = \left\lfloor \frac{D_k + J_i}{T_i} \right\rfloor$,

- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, set* $t_i = \left\lfloor \frac{D_k+J_i}{T_i} \right\rfloor T_i - J_i = g_i T_i - J_i$,
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* α_i *is* $\frac{\sigma g_i}{g_i - J_i/T_i}$*, and*
- *for* $\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)$*, the parameter* β_i *is* $\frac{\sigma}{g_i - J_i/T_i}$.

The tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ *are indexed according to non-decreasing* t_i *defined above to satisfy Definition 1.*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 2. □

Applications: Arrival jitter is very common in task systems, especially when no critical instant theorem has been established. Therefore, instead of exploring all the combinations of the arrival times of the higher-priority tasks, quantifying the scheduling penalty with a jitter term is a common approach. For example, in a self-suspending constrained-deadline sporadic task system, we can quantify the arrival jitter J_i of the higher-priority task $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ as $D_i - C_i$ by assuming that τ_i meets its deadline, e.g., [4]. Suppose that S_i is the self-suspension time of a task τ_i. For a self-suspending implicit-deadline task system under fixed-priority scheduling, it is shown in [4] that the schedulability test is to verify

$$\exists 0 < t \leq T_k \text{ s.t. } C_k + S_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{t + T_i - C_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \right) \leq t. \tag{29}$$

That is, $\sigma = 1$ and J_i is $T_i - C_i$ in Eq. (27). Therefore, we can use Theorem 3 to construct a polynomial-time schedulability test.

4 Conclusion

This report explains how to automatically derive the parameters needed in the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework for several classes of widely used schedulability tests. The procedure to derive the parameters was not clear yet when we developed the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework in [3]. Therefore, the parameters in all the examples in [3] were manually constructed. This automation procedure significantly empowers the $\mathbf{k^2U}$ framework to automatically handle a wide range of classes of real-time execution platforms and task models, including uniprocessor scheduling, multiprocessor scheduling, self-suspending task systems, real-time tasks with arrival jitter, services and virtualizations with bounded delays, etc.

Moreover, we would also like to emphasize that the constructions of the coefficients in this report may not be the best choices. We do not provide any optimality guarantee of the resulting constructions. In fact, given an arbitrary schedulability test, there are many ways to define a corresponding k-point effective schedulability test in Definition 1. All the constructions in this report follow the same design philosophy: *We first identify the tasks that can release at least one more job at time* $0 < t < D_k$ *in the schedulability test and define the effective test point of such a task at its last release before* D_k. There may be other more effective constructions for different schedulability tests. These opportunities are not explored in this report.

Acknowledgement: This report has been supported by DFG, as part of the Collaborative Research Center SFB876 (http://sfb876.tu-dortmund.de/), the priority program "Dependable Embedded Systems" (SPP 1500 - http://spp1500.itec.kit.edu), and NSF grants OISE 1427824 and CNS 1527727. The authors would also like to thank to Mr. Niklas Ueter for his valuable feedback in the draft.

References

[1] J.-J. Chen. Partitioned multiprocessor fixed-priority scheduling of sporadic real-time tasks. *Computing Research Repository (CoRR)*, abs/1505.04693, 2015.

[2] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. k^2Q: A quadratic-form response time and schedulability analysis framework for utilization-based analysis. *Computing Research Repository (CoRR)*, abs/1505.03883, 2015.

[3] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. k^2U: A general framework from k-point effective schedulability analysis to utilization-based tests. In *RTSS*, 2015.

[4] W.-H. Huang, J.-J. Chen, H. Zhou, and C. Liu. PASS: Priority assignment of real-time tasks with dynamic suspending behavior under fixed-priority scheduling. In *Design Automation Conference (DAC)*, 2015.

[5] J. P. Lehoczky, L. Sha, and Y. Ding. The rate monotonic scheduling algorithm: Exact characterization and average case behavior. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 166–171, 1989.

[6] J. Y.-T. Leung and J. Whitehead. On the complexity of fixed-priority scheduling of periodic, real-time tasks. *Perform. Eval.*, 2(4):237–250, 1982.

[7] C. Liu and J.-J. Chen. Bursty-interference analysis techniques for analyzing complex real-time task models. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, 2014.

[8] C. L. Liu and J. W. Layland. Scheduling algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard-real-time environment. *Journal of the ACM*, 20(1):46–61, 1973.

[9] L. Sha. Real-time virtual machines for avionics software porting and development. In *Real-Time and Embedded Computing Systems and Applications, 9th International Conference, RTCSA 2003, Tainan, Taiwan, February 18-20, 2003. Revised Papers*, pages 123–135, 2003.

[10] G. von der Bruggen, J. Chen, and W. Huang. Schedulability and optimization analysis for non-preemptive static priority scheduling based on task utilization and blocking factors. In *27th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems, ECRTS 2015, Lund, Sweden, July 8-10, 2015*, pages 90–101, 2015.

[11] E. Wandeler and L. Thiele. Optimal TDMA time slot and cycle length allocation for hard real-time systems. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Asia South Pacific Design Automation: ASP-DAC 2006, Yokohama, Japan, January 24-27, 2006*, pages 479–484, 2006.

[12] E. Wandeler, L. Thiele, M. Verhoef, and P. Lieverse. System architecture evaluation using modular performance analysis - a case study. *Software Tools for Technology Transfer (STTT)*, 8(6):649 – 667, Oct. 2006.